



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,852	06/22/2006	Juha-Pekka Luoma	915-002.003	5013
4955	7590	08/14/2008	EXAMINER	
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP			RAHMAN, MOHAMMAD N	
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5				
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MONROE, CT 06468			2161	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/14/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/539,852	LUOMA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	MOHAMMAD N. RAHMAN	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,5,7,9,10,13,15,17,18,21-23,25-29,31,34,42-45,53-55,58-61,64,65 and 75-77 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1,2,5,7,9,10,13,15,17,18,21-23,25-29,31,34,42-45,53-55,58-61,64,65 and 75-77.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. The amendment filed on May 15, 2008 has been entered. **Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 13, 17, 18, 21, 23, 25, 26, 34, 42, 43, 53, 55, 58-60, 64, and 65** have been amended and **claim 77** is newly submitted. **Claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20, 24, 30, 32, 33, 35-41, 46-52, 56, 57, 62, 63 and 66-74** are previously canceled. **Claims 1-2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21-23, 25-29, 31, 34, 42-45, 53-55, 58-61, 64, 65, 75-77** are pending in this office action.
2. Applicant's response has overcome the objection to the specification which was mentioned in the last office action but the objection to the specification is sustained on a new ground of rejection.
3. Applicant's amendment also overcomes the previously mentioned claim rejection.
4. Regarding **claims 1,2, 5, 7, 9,10,13, 15,17,18, 21-23, 25-29, 31,34, 43-45, 53-55, 75 and 76**, applicant's response has overcome the 35 USC § 101 rejections. However, the 35 USC § 101 rejections of claims **42, 58-61, 64, and 65** are sustained because the specification does not includes a "processor" or any "computer readable storage medium".

### *Objection to the Specification*

5. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d) (1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Referring to **claims 42, 64, and 65**, applicant has failed to

provide antecedent basis for the claim terminology "computer readable storage medium."

Therefore the question becomes whether non-statutory embodiments would be fairly conveyed to one of ordinary skill given the terminology utilized. In this instance, it would appear to be reasonable to interpret media for "carrying" as fairly conveying signals and other forms of propagation or transmission media to one of ordinary skill.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims to computer-related inventions that are clearly nonstatutory fall into the same general categories as nonstatutory claims in other arts, namely natural phenomena such as magnetism, and abstract ideas or laws of nature which constitute "descriptive material. "Abstract ideas, Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759, or the mere manipulation of abstract ideas, Schrader, 22 F.3d at 292-93, 30 USPQ2d at 1457 58, are not patentable. Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of "data structure" is "a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions." The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).) "Nonfunctional descriptive material" includes but. is not limited to music, literary works and a compilation or mere arrangement of data (See MPEP section 2106, IV, B, 1)

7. **Claims 42, 58-61, 64 and 65** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be

a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. Further, they appear to be non-functional descriptive material *per se*.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because "the sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.").

### **Claim Rejection – 35 USC § 102**

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for

patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. **Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 21-22, 25-29, 31, 34, 42-45, 53-55, 58-61, 64, 65, 75, 76 and 77** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Slaughter et al. (U.S. Application Patent No. 7,080,078 B1), herein referred to as “Slaughter”.

**As to claim 1**, Slaughter teaches, a method comprising:

- “providing a first set of announcements describing a plurality of sessions transmitted through a network” at Fig. 23 and col. 1, lines 25-31, col. 2, lines 14-28 and col. 41, lines 19-23 ; and

(Slaughter teaches, “distributed computing environment may use the Multicast Announcement Protocol (multicast UDP) to announce themselves on a LAN” at col. 41 and lines 19-23 , thus the announcement contains the description of the one or more sessions which is being transmitted through a network.)

- “providing a second set of announcements describing at least one updated session” at col. 21, lines 30-40 and at col. 50, lines 43-52, also about “modification” or “updated session”, see col. 7, lines 59-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5; and

(Slaughter teaches, “the gate may be modified as to the contents of the message schema after the gate is created, including

deleting, adding, or modifying messages in the message schema "at col. 21, lines 30-40 and "to update the various security policies of the space, and other administrative facilities" at col. 240, lines 43-52, which clearly describes **that a set of announcements** being describing at least one updated session.)

• "transmitting said first and second set of announcements" col. 41, lines 19-48. (Slaughter teaches, "distributed computing environment may use the Multicast Announcement Protocol (multicast UDP) to announce themselves on a LAN" at col. 41 and lines 19-48, thus the announcements are being transmitted through a network.)

**Note that claims 9, 43, 55 (about the "processor" see at Slaughter , col. 6 and lines 19-26 and for "output", see col. 92 and lines 40-48) and 75 recite the same corresponding limitations as set forth in claim 1 above, thus the claim is rejected accordingly.**

**As to claim 2**, Slaughter teaches, "a method according to claim 1, wherein transmitting said first and second set of announcements comprises transmitting said first set of announcements through a first channel and transmitting said second set of announcements through a second, different channel" at col. 19, lines 57-61.

**As to claim 5**, Slaughter teaches, "a method according to claim 1, wherein transmitting said first set of announcements and transmitting said second set of announcements comprises transmitting said first set of announcements through a first

IP address and transmitting said second set of announcements through a second, different IP address respectively" at col. 10, lines 52-67 and at col. 11, lines 1-17.

**As to claim 7**, Slaughter teaches, "a method according to claim 1, wherein transmitting said first set of announcements and transmitting said second set of announcements comprises transmitting said first set of announcements through a first port number and transmitting said second set of announcements through a second, different port number respectively" at col. 16, lines 1-10.

**As to claim 10**, Slaughter teaches, "a method according to claim 1, wherein providing said first set of announcements and providing said second set of announcements comprises including in each announcement of said first set of announcements respective data for specifying a position of a corresponding session within a first portion of a session directory and including in each announcement of said second set of announcements respective data for specifying a position of a corresponding session within a second portion of the session directory" at col. 38, lines 13-20.

**As to claim 13**, Slaughter teaches, "a method according to claim 1, further comprising providing a third set of announcements describing another plurality of sessions including said at least one updated session" at col. 42, lines 40-43 and col. 50, lines 43-52.

**Note that claims 28 and 54 recite the same corresponding limitations as set forth in claim 13 above, thus the claim is rejected accordingly.**

**As to claim 15**, Slaughter teaches, “a method according to claim 1, comprising arranging the providing of said second set of announcements after the providing of said first set of announcements” at col. 49, lines 58-62.

**As to claim 21**, Slaughter teaches, “A method according to claim 1, wherein transmitting said first set of announcements comprises transmitting said first set of announcements according to user datagram protocol” at col. 57, lines 1-6.

**As to claim 22**, Slaughter teaches, “a method according to claim 1, comprising including a description of a corresponding session in each announcement” at col. 19, lines 1-5.

**As to claim 25**, Slaughter teaches, “a method according to claim 1, wherein transmitting said first set of announcements comprises said first set of announcements as a series of linked messages” at col. 31, lines 20-24.

**As to claim 26**, Slaughter teaches, “a method according to claim 1, wherein transmitting said first set of announcements comprises transmitting said first set of announcements in a first set of time slots and transmitting said second set of announcements in a second set of time slots, each timeslot of said first set of timeslots being provided at a different time from each timeslot of said second set of timeslots” at col. 48, lines 37-40 and col. 275, lines 45-50.

**As to claim 27**, Slaughter teaches, “a method according to claim 1, comprising multiplexing said first and second sets of announcements” at col. 48, lines 47-65, for

“multiplexing”, see the description about “internet access” and “networks are complex set up”.

**As to claim 29**, Slaughter teaches, “a method according to claim 1, wherein providing the second set of announcements describing the at least one updated session comprises providing a set of announcements identifying the at least one updated session” at col. 21, lines 30-40 and at col. 50, lines 43-52.

**As to claim 31**, Slaughter teaches, “a method according to claim 1, wherein providing the second set of announcements describing the at least one updated session comprises providing a set of notifications pointing to the at least one updated session” at col. 46, lines 58-66 and col. 21, lines 30-40 and at col. 50, lines 43-52.

**As to claim 34**, Slaughter teaches, “a method according to claim 1, comprising transmitting at least one of said sets of announcements according to asynchronous layered coding (ALC) protocol” at col. 58, lines 56-60.

**As to claim 42**, Slaughter teaches, “a computer-readable storage medium encoded with instructions which, when executed by a data processing apparatus, causes the data processing apparatus to perform a method of according to claim 1” at Fig. 23 and col. 1, lines 25-31 and col. 2, lines 14-28.

**As to claim 44**, Slaughter teaches, “a method according to claim 75, further comprising determining whether all of said first set of announcements have been received” at col. 29, lines 33-35.

**As to claim 45**, Slaughter teaches, “a method according to claim 44, further comprising selecting not to receive further said first set of announcements and selecting to receive said second set of announcements” at col. 29, lines 33-35, since the message conductor may or may not interact with the user of the service.

**As to claim 53**, Slaughter teaches, a method comprising:

- “listening to a first set of announcements describing a plurality of sessions transmitted through a network” at col. 41 and lines 19-23 ; and

(Slaughter teaches, “distributed computing environment may use the Multicast Announcement Protocol (multicast UDP)”, thus the announcement contains the description of the one or more sessions that transmitted through a network.)

- “determining whether said first set of announcements have been received” at col. 29, lines 33-35;

(Slaughter teaches, “the message conductor may interact with the user of the service to receive input and display results”, thus the announcements have been received.)

- “if said first set of announcements have been received, then stopping listening to said first set of announcements, listening to a second set of announcements describing at least one updated session and accessing at least one of the plurality of sessions” at col. 29, lines 33-35 and col. 41 and lines 19-23.

(slaughter teaches, "the message conductor may interact with the user of the service to receive input and display results" at col. 29, lines 33-35, which clearly interprets that, since the message conductor may or may not interact with the user of the service, also about the "plurality of sessions", see at col. 41 and lines 19-23.)

**Note that claims 58 and 59 recite the same corresponding limitations as set forth in claims 1 and 53 above, thus the claim is rejected accordingly.**

**As to claim 54,** Slaughter teaches, "a method according to claim 53, further comprising: stopping listening to a third. set of announcements describing a further plurality of sessions including said at least one updated session" at col. 46, lines 58-66 and col. 21, lines 30-40 and at col. 50, lines 43-52.

**Note that claim 76 recite the same corresponding limitations as set forth in claim 54 above, thus the claim is rejected accordingly.**

**As to claim 60,** Slaughter teaches, the apparatus according to claim 59, wherein:

"the receiver is further configured to selectively receive a third set of announcements describing another plurality of sessions including said at least one updated session" at col. 46, lines 58-66 and col. 21, lines 30-40 and at col. 50, lines 43-52; and

“said apparatus is configured such that if the processor determines that said first set of announcements has been received, then the receiver is configured not to receive or not to forward said third set of announcements” at col. 29, lines 33-35.

**As to claim 61**, Slaughter teaches, “The apparatus according to claim 60 which is a mobile communications device” at col. 3, lines 49-51.

**As to claim 64**, Slaughter teaches, “computer-readable storage medium having stored thereon a date structure, comprising two sets of announcements, each set comprising at least one announcement, program schedule data being organized at least partly from a first set of announcements describing at least partly a plurality of sessions and at least partly from a second set of announcements describing at least one at least partly updated session” at “abstract” and col. 8, lines 24-46 and col. 53, lines 47-54 and col. 72, lines 25-39 and col. 21, lines 30-40.

(Slaughter teaches, “The XML schema may specify a set of messages that clients of the service may send to the service” and “the gate may be modified as to the contents of the message schema after the gate is created, including deleting, adding, or modifying messages in the message schema” at col. 21, lines 30-40, thus the one or more announcements contains plurality of session and updated accordingly.)

**Note that claim 65 recite the same corresponding limitations as set forth in claim 64 above, thus the claim is rejected accordingly.**

**As to claim 77**, Slaughter teaches, “A method according to claim 1, comprising transmitting at least one of said sets of announcements according to a protocol based on asynchronous layered coding protocol” at col. 15 and lines 40-51.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. **Claims 17, 18 and 23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slaughter et al. (U.S. Application Patent No. 7,080,078 B1) in view of Reynolds et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0037500), here in referred to as “Reynolds”.

**As per claim 17**, Slaughter teaches, “the message conductor may interact with the user of the service to receive input and display results” at col. 29, lines 33-35 except “a method according to claim 1, wherein transmitting said first set of announcements comprises transmitting said first set of announcements according to a session announcement protocol”.

However, Reynolds teaches, “a method according to claim 1, wherein transmitting said first set of announcements comprises transmitting said first set of announcements according to a session announcement protocol” at paragraph [0013], and lines 1-15.

(Reynolds teaches, “Transport type B include three related data sources: announcements (which can be delivered via the session announcement protocol (SAP)”, which clearly describes about the function of the session announcement protocol.)

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Slaughter et al. teaching of “a method according to claim 1, a method according to claim 1, wherein transmitting said first set of announcements comprises transmitting said first set of announcements according to a session announcement protocol” as taught by Reynolds “Transport type B include three related data sources: announcements (which can be delivered via the session announcement protocol (SAP)” and in order to broadcasting multicast session information, it is very useful to listening application to the well-known SAP multicast address and construct a guide of all advertised multicast sessions.

**As per claim 18**, Slaughter teaches, “the message conductor may interact with the user of the service to receive input and display results” at col. 29, lines 33-35 except “wherein transmitting said first set of announcements comprises transmitting said first set of announcements according to a unidirectional transport protocol”.

However, Reynolds teaches, “wherein transmitting said first set of announcements comprises transmitting said first set of announcements according to a unidirectional transport protocol” at paragraph [0013], and lines 1-15.

(Reynolds teaches, " content (which can be delivered via the unidirectional hypertext transfer protocol (UHTTP)", thus, it is clearly describes here about the unidirectional transport protocol used in a broadcasting of multicast sessions.)

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Slaughter et al. teaching of "a method according to claim 1, wherein transmitting said first set of announcements comprises transmitting said first set of announcements according to a unidirectional transport protocol" as taught by Reynolds, "content (which can be delivered via the unidirectional hypertext transfer protocol (UHTTP)" and in order to transmitting the broadcast of multicast session information efficiently, the unidirectional transport protocol is being used.

**As per claim 23**, Slaughter teaches, "the message conductor may interact with the user of the service to receive input and display results" at col. 29, lines 33-35 except , "a method according to claim 1, comprising including a description of a corresponding session arranged according to session description protocol) in each announcement".

However, Reynolds teaches, "a method according to claim 1, comprising including a description of a corresponding session arranged according to session description protocol in each announcement" at paragraph [0014], and lines 1-3.

(Reynolds teaches, "port defined in the SDP announcement for the enhanced TV program", which clearly describes about the function of the session description protocol (SDP).)

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Slaughter et al. teaching of "a method according to claim 1, comprising including a description of a corresponding session arranged according to session description protocol in each announcement", as taught by Reynolds, "port defined in the SDP announcement for the enhanced TV program", and SDP is used in order to describing multimedia sessions for the purposes of session announcement, session invitation, and other forms of multimedia session initiation.

### ***Response to Arguments***

#### **35 U.S.C. § 102 (e)**

12. Applicant's arguments filed May 15, 2008 have been fully considerer but they are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully traverses applicants' argument.

Claims **1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 21-22, 25-29, 31, 34, 42-45, 53-55, 58-61, 64, 65, 75, 76 and 77** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Slaughter et al. (U.S. Application Patent No. 7,080,078 B1).

**Regarding claim 1**, Applicant's argument stated, "Slaughter does not disclose modifying or updating any of the identification information of a space service which is included in the Multicast Announcement Protocol packet (e.g., URI, keywords) and thus

the packet would be the same both before and after the modifying or updating described in Slaughter". On the contrary, Slaughter teaches, "A space's own advertisement may include an XML schema, a credential or credentials, and a URI (Uniform Resource Identifier) which indicate how to access the space. A client may construct a gate from a space service's advertisement in order to access the space. A client of a space may itself be a service provider seeking to advertise in that space or modify an existing advertisement" at col. 7, lines 59-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5.

Applicant's argument also stated, "Slaughter does not disclose providing a second set of announcements describing at least one updated session". On the contrary, Slaughter teaches, "the gate may be modified as to the contents of the message schema after the gate is created, including deleting, adding, or modifying messages in the message schema" at col. 21, lines 30-40 and "to update the various security policies of the space, and other administrative facilities" at col. 240, lines 43-52, which clearly describes that a set of announcements being describing at least one updated session.

Applicant's argument also stated, "Slaughter does not disclose sessions transmitted over a network, let alone generating the announcements of sessions as specified in claim 1". On the contrary, Slaughter teaches, "distributed computing environment may use the Multicast Announcement Protocol (multicast UDP) to announce themselves on a LAN" at col. 41 and lines 19-23, thus the announcement contains the description of the one or more sessions which is being transmitted through

a network. About the network terminology also see at Fig. 23 and col. 1, lines 25-31, col. 2, lines 14-28 and col. 41, lines 19-23.

In light of the foregoing arguments the 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) rejections are hereby sustained.

### ***Conclusion***

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Contact Information***

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad N. Rahman whose telephone number is 571-270-1631. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am - 5:00 pm, Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mofiz Apu M can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ M. Rahman /  
AU 2161  
08/08/2008

/K. B. P./

/Apu M Mofiz/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161